Transcription ICANN Beijing Meetings

GNSO Wrap-Up Session

Thursday 11 April 2013 at 10:30 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#apr

Jonathan Robinson: Good morning everyone, welcome to the GNSO Council wrap up session on April 11 - 11, yes. I'm already anticipating the 12 - Thursday morning here in Beijing.

It's our opportunity as you know to have a relatively informal meeting where we try and capture the key outcomes of the - both the weekend sessions in our formal meeting and set ourselves up in good shape to take our work forward from here.

So we have compiled a list of topics that I know most of you have only seen very recently if not now for the first time. However, none of them should be new or unique. They should all arise from our weekend sessions and/or yesterday's meeting.

I think it probably makes sense to step through the topics. Already we've turned some of them into action items so they should already be captured. Given the limited time we've got, providing you are happy with the action item arising, I encourage you to just briefly support that or - I'll take a lack of intervention as support for the action.

But let's start with the - with our Council Board meeting. The predominate theme there was the role of the Council in the multistakeholder approach and

really my take on that - and I'd welcome any comment or input on this, is that our proposed comments or planned comment at the public forum today as well as a letter to a similar effect to the Board, the ICANN Board, will cover the key item arising from that.

And what we plan to do as you know from the statement which we should probably look at briefly a little later is to assert that if the executive or the Board seek to take a course of action in future that's - is in - is contrary to established policy that we seek reference back to the Council and - so that's the essence of what we have agreed.

And I think that's the primary action. Is there any other action that comes out of the Board meeting that you would like to remind us or me? I've Joy first and then (John).

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, (Jonathan). Joy Liddicoat for the record. You know, there's one item that related to the Council (unintelligible) managing policy development and it was a suggestion that could be an item on the agenda for discussion that the Board puts forth just - with focused on strategically what is the status play with the Council's management of their role.

So what's the scope of the current work program, their receiving agenda with (unintelligible) in terms of calibration, you know, a sort of the State of the Nation on the overview of the Council's work above and beyond sort of the specific issues which we might be talking to the Board about on any particular day. And that that might be a useful agenda item as sort of a standard agenda item with the Board.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Joy. So just to make sure I captured that, the suggestion there is that we have a standing item in our - or the - perceived outcome was that we have a standard agenda item that somehow captures what - just to make sure I've got it absolutely correct.

Joy Liddicoat: It captures the current state of the Council's management of - as policy work. You know, the Board's scope of things that (unintelligible) about the size of that in light of, you know, the resources we've got, and sort of a forward look about that over the next sort of quarter - you know, the next conversation after - beyond the specific, you know, any particular policy measures of the day that might be more of a useful sort of conversation in net management role of the Board to have in addition to those other items.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, that's a very good point and I could see that, before coming to (John), how that might work.

I mean typically if we were in management function reporting to a Board I would expect that we'd say this is where we're at and this is where were going and perhaps the point is that we tend to focus on this is where we're at or these are the hot topics that are bothering us and in fact if we could - which is talk to the Board we had on strategy as well and sort of more strategic view. (John), does your point link to that?

John Berard: Sure.

Jonathan Robinson: It doesn't have to.

John Berard: No, no, yes it does in fact. I want to make sure that the councilors are - catch the email I sent out earlier. I would like to take (Ray) at his suggestion and forward some comment tarried to Brian Cute and the (ADRP) 2 committee as to where they might look as they probe the policy as (Ray) said.

They're focusing on the policy in their review and I'd like to point them at some things that we at the Council think that they should look at.

I would also ask that the item that the - near the bottom of this list, the plural versus singular new gTLDs be put closer to the top of the list. Not only was it

a subject of conversation but I think it is a - it gained a lot of urgency over the course of the day.

And I do think that if there is an opportunity to step in - and I think also there was an earlier email I sent out thanks to the research capabilities of Marika that indicate a standing on which we can inject ourselves. I'd like to have that conversation as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so (John), I take - just to - we've got two points coming out of what we talked about with (Joy). First of all, one is our message to the Board - capturing the items - the similar items for public comment. The second is when and if we meet the Board ensuring that we have a forward-looking more - a strategic focus.

And then coming on to your points, (John), just if you can cast your eye down to that point, that asterisk point called GNSO Review, my feeling is that the sub bullet under that capture, the kind of points you are making.

And it describes - we took a look at the self review that was suggested that we actually take some form of initiative on a self review that we look at (Bruce)'s point which is looking at the previous GNSO self review work.

We make sure we understand any link or overlap with the work of the (ADRP) 2 and that also at the every least, I reach out and make the link with (Ray) and the work that he's doing.

Does that cover - I'm not talking about the plural and singulars but does that cover your first point?

John Berard: It does far more broadly than I intended. The opportunity was to give Brian specific areas in which we would like him to look and his committee to look. So that's my suggestion.

If you want to take it further that's cool but I did not want to let - I mean because (Ray) has already asked me twice since our meeting over the weekend if we've done that. And I don't want to miss the opportunity.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, so if we could capture that, Marika, that'd be great but I - you know, I think for me there is a broader work that is a sort of - a piece of broader work and I want to make sure that that piece of broader work encapsulated what you were suggested, that nevertheless if there is something specific and short term we could and should be doing then we should do that as well.

So that's - are there any objections - Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. On providing to the (ADRP) because I think the (ADRP) does have a public comment forum over these specific questions so that may be something - small group or someone may want to take the lead in to look at what lead information the Council can provide in that regard as a Council response possibly.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I heard (John) volunteering to lead that small group.

John Berard: Right, I was just hoping to keep it the size of a PT boat, not make it an aircraft carrier, that's all.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So next point was the possibility of raising up the agenda, this issue of plural and singular. And I think - are there any objections to bringing that further up the agenda now in terms of our wrap up session or comments on that? Osvaldo?

Osvaldo Novoa: I've seen a lot of emails regarding this theme but it seems that there is a lot of going on backstage of this. So I'm feel about - a bit lost about that theme. What I see is that we have the guidebook and it seems that the - and the

guidance is being followed. All the process is being done as it was agreed on the - several years we had been working.

So I don't know if the - if it's right for the GNSO to go on review that.

Jonathan Robinson: So that's a very good point, Osvaldo. We could all collectively and individually around this table have a number of opinions. I have some personal opinions on the matter and so on.

So you're absolutely right to bring us back to what is our role in this? What prior policy recommendation did we make? Do we need to remind anyone of those prior policy recommendations? And is there anything else specific and relevant and appropriate that we as a Council should be doing?

So I think we just need to keep our conversation focused on that rather than any opinions. So that's - I - if we can focus in that way that would be very helpful.

Marika and I see some nodding heads or potential comments but Marika go ahead, and please let me know if there's anything else, any of the councilors or anyone in the room frankly would like to say.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. On the issue (John) asked me earlier today to check back and see what was discussed in this regard in the new gTLD related discussions.

I did tell him - I mean I wasn't at ICANN at the time so I don't know anything from memories. But I actually just looked at the new gTLD report that was approved and the only thing I could find there that is recommendation to that says string must not be confusingly similar to an existing top level domain.

But as I suggest as well in the email that (John) forwarded to the Council and maybe worth checking with some of the others that were involved in this - the

overall discussions to see if they recall whether the issue of new gTLDs being similar or confusingly similar to each other, if that was specifically discussed or called out anywhere that we can refer to.

Jonathan Robinson: So I have Ching in the queue but - and Wendy, Ching and Wendy. So before doing that, that point I think we should capture and close that what the Council should do is look at our prior policy recommendations and satisfy ourselves if or not the work that has been undertaken is consistent with those. That is the question and that is the question we should seek to answer.

And to the extent that it is not we should make that point well known. What other questions or points should we make? (Ching) and then Wendy I've got.

Ching Chiao: Actually (Jonathan) you have covered my point. But just one echo to what has just been said is that there's also priorities that we need to be aware of for those new gTLD implementation - I mean process. I mean your point is absolutely right and we should focusing our - on our roles. And also - I mean realizing there's also priorities of issues such as this (unintelligible) issue and also the IDN issue which (unintelligible) think about.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. Sorry, Wendy next.

Wendy Seltzer: Yes, just - to wholeheartedly endorse the - our role as a Council should be to ask whether our advice was followed and look for places where that differs. Other issues we can debate as individual constituencies among ourselves but I think we don't need to do it here.

Jonathan Robinson: So our intention is to review our advice and to the extent that our advice has not been followed, make that well known and understood. Can I have any other inputs or comments that relate to specifically our role as a Council and how we might intervene or not on this singular and plural issue?

There was one thing suggested to me yesterday and I think it came from - I think it came up from a conversation with Chuck and that is the transparency or not of the process by which - so I mean the question is do we have a role in seeking for accountability and transparency in how these decisions were made.

I mean my understanding is we don't have any clear visibility of who was in that expert working group or how they - expert group or how they reached those decisions.

So that may not be a role for the Council. It may be that somewhere else within the community that that point can be made. Comments or questions briefly?

John Berard: There was some research that was done by one of my colleagues in the business constituency suggests that there are UDRP decisions that speak to the distinction or not between singulars and plurals. We might want to reach out in that regard.

Also I - staff statements on the record occurred a year ago talking about - that consumer confusion is a human reaction which is not specifically in the guidebook but certainly singular and plurals seem to me that human reaction would be confusing.

So I think there's plenty of reasons to watch - that it should be looked again. The question is is there a Council specific opportunity? I think there is and so we'd just like to, you know, have the discussion if we think as a Council that is should be reviewed then I'd be in favor of that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so I've heard so far very strong support for us making sure we remain very focused on our role as a Council in this - and to the extent that this pertains to our role as a Council - as policy manager and as to the prior recommendations we have made.

And if the point that you made - you, (John), have made provides some sort of color or example to it then so be it. If not then perhaps that's work for your individual constituency or group to make known in and around this subject.

Okay, so I suggest we pick up as we have said we will do. We will frame our - any response we may take in terms of the consistency or not with prior Council advice.

If there are other items that add color or substance to it that are provided by councilors through the work done in their own constituencies or stakeholder groups we can utilize that. And if they are relevant they can be provided by the work that's being done in those - no doubt by those constituencies or groups.

So let's close that item off then. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Sorry, for being late on that (Jonathan). With regard to the accountability and transparency, it may be you can't really determine whether they fulfilled the recommendation - two of the new gTLD recommendations without getting more accountability and transparency.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, thank you, Chuck. So I mean that would give us the opportunity to both compare and satisfy our self to the extent that we can - that it's visible and raise the point that without full visibility we are perhaps unable to determine that in full.

Great. So we'll close off that discussion and we've brought that further up the agenda so in terms of where we are - Ching, let me give you the point that you were seeking which is to bring your item as a - as urgent items, the top of our list.

So if you could just raise that and briefly - sort of in context again. I know we have heard from you and if - because at the moment we have an action arising from that, which is for staff to appraise us and keep us up to date. Is there anything else you feel that the Council could or should be doing to assist in this area?

Ching Chiao: Right, I think it's a point of discussion and also a point of - the notice that the Council should probably be aware of - for the past six months to one year we have seen - let me just take it back once again.

Since the launch of the new gTLD I know lots of attention is pretty much on how the program process and evolves to this stage. And now we are actually looking at the delegation of the first 100 new gTLD which are actually all IDNs.

I mean - so it's - IDN TLDs which will be dealing with - I mean both on the operational ends with the contractual or the - I mean other technical - I mean aspects such as variant (unintelligible) delegation.

And we're also looking at a follow up action pretty soon for the revision - potential revision of the AGB to incorporate those we have done right or those we have not done right in this first round.

But in - for - but for the council at this point, the reason that I actually would like to have a brief discussion here is that not only in the Council but actually in the overall ICANN community it seems that the lack of interest which we actually phrase in very - kind of straight forward way is that it seems that in the past the IDN issues only belongs to a ccTDL - I mean point of interest in most of the discussion.

And we have seen the fast track that's being done and it's still ongoing and now is time for the gTLD to - I mean actually to deal with both contractual

issue and also the technical issue, which that would evolve - I mean security also, consumer protection on that regard.

So final point on this - so I would really like to see, for example, kind of crystallize the process.

I mean without knowing too much of the - I mean with - I mean without getting involved in too much of the - I mean applicants, in the individual process, but really to have staff to work with the Council or - I mean - and individually or as you collectively on the - in the next three to six months how the IDN gTLDs really been delegated there, how they get operated.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. I have a thought here but I see that Marika would like to say something and Joy.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I have an offer from Steve Sheng to coordinate, this is from a staff perspective, staff on this issue and provide some IDN extras, provide a councilor with regular updates on IDN issues and this could be in a form of an IDN tutorial followed by current hot topics in IDN, IDN development, and policy issues.

So if that would be welcomed we'll make sure to coordinate that from our side at least.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika and thanks, Steve, for that. Joy?

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, (Jonathan). Yes, Ching, I think it would help for us to be thinking about what the specific things that you would like the Council to be doing on this topic because I know it's near to your heart.

It's been an important part of the work the Council is doing but I'm sometimes struggling to know what quite exact thing is the best way to support the focus

of the work. So I mean if you have a specific proposal that you want to share even on the Council listing I think that would also be helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me perhaps see if I can help here. I mean my thoughts - and it occurs to me that really, you know, again, thinking about the Council's role as policy manager and thinking of what we have done to date, I mean it could be that - but also thinking about the current discussion about the relationship between policy and implementation, it strikes me that actually the primary issues here are those of implementation.

But nevertheless, the - ICANN as a whole has chosen to go ahead with launching IDNs first which is a perceived benefit to the boarder community and to the new gTLD program. So I think we could write potentially to the Board and saying it's come to our attention that not withstanding our role as policy manager there are implementation issues - ongoing implementation issues.

And in light of the current discussion around the relationship - the close interrelationship between policy and implementation, and we could make that linked there that the Council has some concern over the effective, thorough, and comprehensive implementation of the IDN component of the new gTLD program.

And the Council has taken the step of being actively an ongoing - of a - requiring active and ongoing information about the implementation. And we would seek perhaps assurance that the Board is - has it similarly high on its radar screen. John?

John Berard: So - this is John Berard. Are you - I guess I'm getting confused. Are you now talking about the - what you will be saying at the public forum? Have you now expanded that? Or are we right now just describing the shorter list of topics that we're going to deal with the rest of this morning? I'm unsure of that because I would like some clarity on...

Jonathan Robinson: John, let me help the refocus, this is our wrap up session, this looks at all of the current open items on our agenda. One open item we have is what I will say at the public forum, I would seek to keep that item to what we agreed yesterday.

Nevertheless, one item on our wrap up session agenda is this concern - well, as you raised over plural and singular as we just dealt with and as Ching has raised, an ongoing - a perceived lack of interest in the thorough implementation of IDN related issues and the high attention.

So I'm saying an option for us as a Council is to write to the Board saying, during the course of this meeting in Beijing appropriately it's come to our attention that the implementation of - and in the context of the ongoing discussion of policy and implementation.

It's come to our attention that there are issues around the implementation of IDNs within the new gTLD program and we are going to be kept informed and updated on it. And we would seek to be assured that the Board is being similarly vigilant.

Ching and then John. Or John, would you like to respond to...

John Berard: I'm just sorry, is your plan also then a separate letter, the same kind of thing (unintelligible) with singular and plural.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct, yes, that's what I'm proposing, a separate letter on this particular topic.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, (Jonathan). And thank you, John, for the clarification. I'm happy to help you with that and you've got the (unintelligible) I think that's definitely the right thing to do.

Actually, in fact, in last day's VIPE and yesterday's VIP - IDN VIP session I did make some constructive suggestion to the staff on the how - actually doing a potentially eight-month - I mean window from the first delegation potentially August this year to the - kind of the finishing line of the VIP and works.

There's a kind of eight months window which we are actually put our - the ICANN reputation and the consumer - I mean protection in kind of a risk.

So I'll be happy to make constructive point - constructive point and to help you to draft the - that particular (unintelligible). And also for the record, I really still wish to - I mean acknowledge that the staff for the past, you know, ten or 15 years, I mean working on this IDN issue.

I mean not only with Steve Sheng with others in the community. That (unintelligible) is - it's just not - just need to be recognized and I think for the - it's kind of the last mile for the full realization of the IDN which you will probably need to - I mean keep an eye on.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. I'm going to close that item then. Sorry, Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Very briefly, I just wanted to acknowledge that and suggest that because - in the way that lots of other issues have just been bubbling around Council people - observers could get the impression that we don't care about IDNs.

And so if there's a way for us to sort of explicitly acknowledge the work that's gone in and even if it's not in a policy sense that there are policy problems, perhaps we can make that a part of our next discussion as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Wendy. Apparently I ignored (unintelligible) desire to contribute twice at the meeting yesterday so I intend to make that a third time now. (Unintelligible)?

Man: Very shortly, just plus one.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So we're clear, we're going to link it to the ongoing discussion on
                     linking policy and implementation. We're going to write - we're going to deal
                     with this. Thanks, Ching, thanks, (unintelligible), thanks everyone that
                     contributed on that topic.

                     Let's move back up the list, Marika, if you could just scroll it up for me a little
                     so we're - we pop up back up track. I - on the GNSO GAC Board
                     recommendation implementation working group I think we've got some
                     ongoing work. I mean that's at a kind of a liaison level with the Board GAC
                     recommendation implementation working group.

                     I would like to seek Council's permission to just continue that dialog. I'm not
                     exactly sure of the specific action that we will take. I mean one option -
                     Marika has very kindly in the background prepared a tabular summary of
                     opportunities for - I think it's - if you like, third party interaction with the GNSO
                     policy development process, which may well be a useful tool in that
                     discussion.

                     But I don't want to presume that that's simply going to be pinged across via a
                     letter because really - at a sort of a dialog liaison state.

                     So with your permission I'd like to carry on, you know, interacting with the
                     Board GAC recommendation implementation working group and see - and
                     bring things back to the Council as that discussion ripens. I'm open to any
                     comments or input on that. Marika first and then (Thomas).

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to give a little bit more background on the document I
                  prepared because basically listening to the conversation it seemed that, you
                  know, (Jonathan) outlined all the opportunities that there are for GAC
                  participation or input into a GNSO PDP.

And then I think (Suzanne) said, well, this is all things we'd like to have and I was thinking, well, you're actually already getting it but there seems to be that there is a disconnect when or how we're asking it as to - compared to how they need or want to receive it.

So indeed the idea behind a document is that we've listed all the opportunities that exist currently in the GNSO PDP for input from other SOs and (unintelligible). We've also indicated then how is that input being sought.

And then basically we've left an empty table or empty entry that basically says, well, maybe the GAC can tell us how they would like to receive it because most of the things, for example, we currently sent to secretariat. Maybe they say, well, actually that should be, you know, directly sent by (Jonathan) to the Chair, maybe that's the way of communication.

So maybe trying to see as a starting point we can have some easy improvement in the way we currently do things that may already satisfy some of their desires to have early notice and an early opportunity to actually be engaged which we already do provide under the current roles.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. So I suggest that if you wouldn't mind - yes, if you could just send that the Council anyway so everyone's clear on what that contains. And then let's move along the queue then to (Thomas) and then...

Thomas Rickert: Thank you, (Jonathan). Getting back to the point that some of the things that GAC have asked for are already built in the process. I think at the risk of upsetting some people I think we should discuss potential ways to accommodate their requests and maybe even, you know, sending them extra notes or an additional letter and - you know, on top of what we're doing anyway when we reach out for request for input.

Because I guess what has become very clear is that there are different ways between the GNSO and the GAC as to how they operate. And I think it's - if

it's just sending an additional letter or trying to find additional communication channels then we usually use in order to get them engaged, we should use that opportunity.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me very clear, that is exactly the objective of any interaction with the Board GAC recommendation implementation working group, that is exactly what the purpose of it is to have a dialog about how best to do that and what language to speak when we do that rather than say, it's all on the website, haven't you seen kind of thing.

Thomas Rickert: So I'm also in for that because I think that, you know, we should use these opportunities. And also, I think one point that we haven't yet touched upon now is how we would set up the liaison if the GAC should ask for it. Who should that be?

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. There was a suggestion of a so-called reverse liaison and what that was.

Okay, so I've got a queue, which is (Thomas), yourself have just spoken. (Unintelligible), Joy, and Chuck.

Man: Yes, so I think that also (unintelligible) heard that they're asking for a liaison. I think there is a better way to interact and if we set up some kind of a (unintelligible) community - standard community that we have to (unintelligible) that would have two people from the Council, one from each house, and a couple people from the GAC, whoever they want.

We'll have a monthly phone call to set this up. It's not too hard. Doesn't need to be too official. And I think that will provide a much better communication.

I know that I personally have a (unintelligible), you know, outside of the room with some of the GAC people and there the communication (unintelligible) is

much better when it's done this way than sending letters and that. So if we do it on a monthly basis I think that's a practical way to move forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (unintelligible). So just to make sure that it's absolutely clear, that none of this - that these are good suggestions. My overarching suggestion is that we take these and feed them currently into the interaction with the RGRI working group and ultimately these may percolate up to be the solution.

So if they don't appear to be an action that we're taking right away picking up on a suggestion that's my mechanism I think for developing it. But let's hear from Zahid and Joy.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you. Just a number of things that I heard as - things they wanted us to address in a sense - or for both of us to address, one is communication which is if we send a letter so a copy wouldn't be sufficient in actual communication but they wanted to hear in the communication, from what I understood, was they wanted some clear timelines.

How much time do we have and could you accommodate enough time for us to respond? It may be useful in that letter to lay out, you know, the charter will be done in so many weeks and you would have an opportunity and the issues report is going to go out.

So even though if it's an annex and it's repeated every single time let's do that so that they cannot say in a sense, look, we didn't know exactly what the timelines were. We couldn't react, we couldn't respond. And we have the sufficient timelines as I've indicted in the meeting.

On the issue of should we red flag issues or not, I think that's a little bit more challenging, but if we can in a letter and if we feel as a Council that this is something we should draw the attention of the GAC to in the work that we're doing maybe we should do that.

And as far as the (unintelligible) is concerned, I completely agree with (unintelligible). It will be helpful to have standing committees working. You know, and you could have the reverse liaison and have the standing committee also or the committees as well. And having that committee meet earlier in the week at a GNSO meeting may be one way to go so that we can prepared before we get into the GAC Board meeting, just like you, (Jonathan), do that as a Chair and engagement with them.

I would also suggest that irrespective of what happens in that working group, I think we should take certain actions as a GNSO Council on our own. I don't know if that's possible but if we can let's just sort of implement it going forward as of this meeting, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Zahid. Joy and then Chuck.

Joy Liddicoat: Sure, Chuck, you're standing. I'm sitting. So (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. Chuck Gomes. As I recall from the GAC GNSO session the other day, and I think it was on a slide, there were three specific new suggestions that were made. I don't remember whether the reverse liaison was one of those, I think that came up in the meeting.

But all I'm suggesting - and I can't tell you what those three were but I thought they were potential suggestions for improvement and they came from the GAC. So all I'm saying is let's identify those and keep this - keep them in the mix here in what you're doing.

Lastly, with regard to specific ideas - well, a general principle first is to keep our communications with the GAC very brief. You know, an issues report is way too much information.

But with an issues report - and this is a good first step in policy processes is to just give them a list of issues that are going to be considered and ask them

to flag any that they think might be of public interest, real simple, can be brief. But it's a good way to get started and it will tell us, they think these might be - we know to then particularly focus on the GAC with regard to those issues.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that's - Chuck - Joy, if I may just respond to that, I think that's a very good suggestion and I think it deals with Zahid's point, I don't think it should be up to us to red flag these public interest issues.

I think it should be up to us to highlight the issues considered as you say and the GAC can determine whether or not they are in the GAC's view matters of public interest.

So I think that's - I hope that takes your red flag point, Zahid, and deals with it because I think it's a very good suggestion. Joy?

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, (Jonathan), and just to pick up on a point that Chuck was making, I think the GAC continually tells us that it cannot - the (unintelligible) cannot engage in policy development processes in the way that other members of the community can.

And we can debate whether we agree with that or not or our thoughts about that but that's their continued strong position.

But I think if we're to - while it's helpful to be sending them information about the policy development processes they're going through and we've had - they might be able to hear the input, I think we need to also add to the conversation this higher legal discussion about our overall root program, forward look, what's coming up, asking them, you know, what are their pinch points in their work programs, you know.

It might be - case in point, timing wise. And yes, perhaps as Chuck said, they want to discuss any flag - I won't say red flag, any point they want to make

about how they can see a potential public issue forward looking, that might be a better way to be having the conversation.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, do you want to respond specifically to Joy's point?

Marika Konings: I was more responding to the comments of Chuck and Zahid so - go first.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Mason and then Marika. Great, who did I miss in the queue then? (Thomas), sorry.

Thomas Rickert: Just a quick point, I think that we might wish to make very clear to the GAC that - the issue that they refer to that GAC - the members can't engage early because they can't speak for the governments or even for the GAC.

That hits almost everybody working in working groups. So I think it would be worthwhile pointing out that those working in working groups give their ad hoc feedback in a personal capacity but prior to consensus call or even before that they would also need to consult with their respective groups.

So I think that, you know, it might be worthwhile highlighting that maybe even in a separate email to have a - or whatever way but we're all in the same boat there except for the (NCAs) maybe but maybe that could lower the entrance barrier for GAC individuals to engage with us earlier.

Jonathan Robinson: (Thomas), just to respond briefly, we did hear also from the GAC that they would be more than willing to engage on an interpersonal, informal level and not withstanding that concern.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, but this has been very clear - I think by the representing some of the European commissions that they would not engage because they have this hesitation that what they say might be taken as an official government or GAC position.

And I think that we should make very clear as we do in our working group deliberations that we do not attribute statements made there through the respective organizations that they stand for.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Mason and Marika and (unintelligible).

Mason Cole: I just want to follow up on a couple of points. I think - I fully agree with what (Thomas) just said and I'll characterize it another way. I think that even though we did have a productive session with the GAC.

I think the first of the steps for property interacting with the GAC is to set expectations for the GAC about how we will interact with them and how they should interact with us.

I don't mean that to be as harsh as it sounds but the danger I think that we should avoid is having GNSO work held up unintentionally by the fact that sometimes the GAC works slower, more slowly than we do.

I think Zahid's suggestion is a very good one to have regular calls with the GAC so that they understand what we're up to, once a month, once every couple of months, whether it's Chair to Chair or liaison to liaison. I don't necessarily think it matters.

It feels me like there's an element here - you know, you can lead the GAC to water but, you know, you can't make it to do the drinking. So we're going to need to - we should and can do as much as we are able to do. I just want to make sure that it's within correct bounds and we don't find ourselves being unnecessarily roadblocks because we're continually waiting for GAC input.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mason. Marika, Zahid. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just (unintelligible) as well, response to comments that Zahid made as well as Chuck that we do have this pilot project in place where

we do provide a one-page brief on each of the PDP that - PDPs that is ongoing.

That also then - right clearly at the top identifies what is the next opportunity for GAC input and what is the timeline for that. And also shows in what stage of the PDP it is and provide as much detail on the timing.

We will have gone back to them as well to ask them, like, do they find that useful and we're still in the process as well of evaluating that with them if that is indeed something that is useful to them or whether it should be another format or, you know, should we be providing oral briefings.

But I think it's something where we're trying to look at maybe providing it to them in a digestible format but at the same time we're very conscious as well that it's not for us to decide which PDPs may have public policy implications.

So we just send them a brief on every PDP and it's really for them to make the determination on, you know, which one should get a red flag and which ones done.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika, which is why I made the earlier point about linking it in to the CGRI working group, that's - you know, Bill Graham who's - and I think (David), all of this is an active (unintelligible). So ICANN policy staff, Bill, are - absolutely linked in to this.

So it's not like we're operating in a vacuum. I just want to make sure that all these suggestions are very positive and practical but they need to find a way of coming to fruition.

So - which is why I suggest we work in that way. I've got Zahid, Milton, and (David), and I think we should call it a day on this topic.

Zahid Jamil: So yes, Marika, yes; graphics, pictures, I'm just kidding. On the issue of liaison and a Chair, etc., I think it's - there are times when the GNSO is viewed by the GAC at least as a monolith.

You know, you, the GNSO are doing this. It's helpful therefore to have, as you have suggested, a group or, you know, two or three or four people sort of meet with them so they can get those - get that distinction.

On the issue that (Thomas) raised, I agree, it's difficult for us to say, look, you know, you need to participate but then you need to wait as long as possible to get, you know, decisions from capital.

I think - and I'm not suggesting that this is a position that we should sort of agree with necessarily but their challenge is that if their - the name is there on a transcribed working group - you know, transcript because we have transcription then they feel that might be an attribution and then they can be called out on it, etc.

That may be sort of the concern we have and I don't know what the solution to that is but I think we do have to engage and ask them. They have to come up with their own solution.

Jonathan Robinson: Milton?

Milton Mueller: Yes, picking up on the so-called reverse liaison, I received encouragement from one particular GAC member to - for the GNSO to submit a written proposal on that topic, probably this person spoke to me because I had (unintelligible), you know, been somewhat outspoken about it.

We might think of a name - certainly we don't want to keep this reverse business, there's nothing reverse or forward or backward about it, but I want to make two points on the nature of this that I think any such letter should stress.

Number one, this liaison should have - should be in a position to provide continuous and ongoing interventions in GAC meetings. In other words, this is - the whole model of having a 15-minute presentation in front of the GAC, which they will forget 15 minutes later is not going to work. We know that.

The idea of having the Council go in there and talk to them has some value but, again, did not do what needs to be done in terms of coordination of two streams of work.

So we really need to convey the point that this is somebody who sits in there and equal status with the GAC member and can intervene at any time to represent what the GNSO is doing and how it relates to what the GAC is doing.

There are two problems with this idea that have to be solved (unintelligible). One is the issue of closed sessions, in other words, when can the GAC throw this person out of the room in essence. I would argue never but the GAC would not accept that.

Therefore you'd need to find some way in which that is compromised and it has to be a way in which this, again, doesn't get reduced into a person who sits in there for 15 minutes and then goes away.

The other problem is whoever is capable of doing the job as I conceive of it would have the problem of being in two places at once. In other words, they have to know enough about the GNSO to be able to represent its work stream in the GAC process.

And yet if they're not in the GNSO they're in all the GAC meetings, they're not going to be spending much time in GNSO. So that's a pretty interesting problem but I'm sure that there are enough split personalities here that are - that might be able to get worked out somehow.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Milton. (David)?

David Cake: Just wanted to - yes, of course, we always talk about this in generalities and specifics. The GAC is not equally interested in everything the GNSO does. In many of the things we do they - you know, profoundly uninterested in the (unintelligible) having a public policy role.

What we really need to do is rather than - I mean to a large extent is not worry about the liaison - how we liaise in terms of what overall - what the GNSO is doing.

What we really need to do is put a lot more effort into liaising with the GAC about the specific work groups and things that they are very interested in and - I mean they really don't care about a lot of the things we do and that's as it should be.

But things like the IGO working group and things may be the things - those issues where the GAC is keenly interested in what we are doing but we need to work on not overall Council strategy for letting them know the progress of IRCPD and so forth, which I'm pretty sure most of the GAC are barely understand what it's about.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (David). I agree. That is some very practical suggestions that have come in and so we'll try and capture as much of that as we can and seek some ways forward.

Like I said, they may well end up being through the work with the (BGRI) working group or external to that if we see - if it's - if it makes sense. But there's quite a lot that's come through and that's some real thinking gone into that. So much appreciated.

Let's try and move us on down through the agenda now. There is a lot to cover. I think we have until 12:30. Can someone remind me? I think we have another hour to go so we should be able - if we're efficient we should be able to get a lot of this ticked off.

Let me deal with what I hope will be a relatively small item next is the expert working group. I've skipped over (unintelligible) for a moment.

As far as I recall, the expert working group - really our primary issue is whether they are working extraneous to the Council's and the GNSO policy development process. We've had various reassurances that this is not the case. It's really a question of how we cement that understanding.

So any thoughts or comments on that? Mason?

Mason Cole: Thank you. I had a conversation with (Jon François) who's leading up the expert working group on behalf of ICANN staff and he was very clear that the expert working group was not meant to preempt any GNSO process.

But he was looking for input on the way that the working group could best accommodate the Council's needs. So he's looking for input from councilors, specifically about how to tailor the report or even gather the information so that it can be best put to use by us when it's time to consider policy.

So I was reassured by (Jon Francois) (unintelligible) in his input on that and I think we have an opportunity to shape the kind of data that is given to us when it's - when it comes to policy time.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mason. So that - (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you, (Jonathan). This was a (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) whatever the (unintelligible) input (unintelligible) GNSO PDP process. And

particularly (unintelligible) the working group is expecting for some input from the (unintelligible) working group.

So it will be nice if we can give our thoughts around the (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) probably be some kind of input to the working group. There are a set of questions sent out in there which have (unintelligible) through their constituents which is (unintelligible) that input. It would be a good idea (unintelligible) the input to the working group.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (unintelligible). I think that's so - I guess where this is going is over and above simply asserting that we want - that is, the Council's expectation that such work is undertaken consistent with our - with the GNSO policy making processes is a question of what, if anything.

And perhaps you could guide us, (unintelligible), a sort of - are you the Council rep on that? Or are you just an individual on that expert working group? If you could just remind me.

Man: (Unintelligible) council rep (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Nevertheless you can keep us informed and perhaps nudge us as to where and how we might provide appropriate input and so I think it's something that's incumbent on us on our action is to take - I'm just wondering how we ensure practically that we both get the assurance we require having had it in various ways.

And maybe writing to a combination of the Chair of that working group, (Jon Francois) and - a letter that covers that. But I think we - the suggestion I'm hearing is we do something more practical and positive if we possibly can as well.

All right, I'll close that item then. And if there are any further comment or input - now we've got ICANN Durbin on our - the next meeting organization on our schedule. Clearly one of the most burning issues is how near it is.

Are there any...

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: So you have a - not in stone written process here I think so that means that we are - excuse me, so that the vice chair's taking all the opportunity and obligation to prepare for a certain - for the different ICANN meetings, especially for the GNSO sessions here.

This time there was wonderfully done, this job by Mason, and I am going to take that over for the next meeting in Durbin. So as (Jonathan) said, Durbin is quite - after this meeting. It's not - there's not a gap, only - like it used to be between Toronto and here.

So we have just - almost less than three months left and we should start immediately to organize it. But what I have in mind is immediately after this meeting I am going to send an email to the leaders of the stakeholder groups and constituencies making them aware about that, about the fact.

And coming up is specific topics which I would like to get input from them towards the organization of that meeting.

So that is specifically as we usually do, the Board - the common meeting with the Board and GAC, issues for that - items to be covered, ideas with regarding that.

The meeting with various GAC - we will have the meeting with the (unintelligible) GNSO and other topics we should cover. So asking for input with regard to the (unintelligible) of that meeting, that's what I intend to do and I'm open to any comment and immediately look for that.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks, (Wolf), and thanks for stepping up to the plate. I've got a couple of comments and then - I see Wendy's in the queue as well. I mean for me where I'd like to direct this conversation if at all possible is to essentially any critical appraisal of the way in which we've undertaken our work schedule and items this - at this meeting.

So for example, we met with the Board and prior to our meeting with the Board I had agreed with (Steve) that these would be - that we would put our topics on the table and by - the informal accounts I've received so far, our meeting with the Board was a successful and constructive meeting.

On the contrary, our meeting with the ccNSO really needs rework, restructure or something. It didn't really get off the ground and unless we're to sort of revamp that - and then I know there were some comments about the way in which we perhaps we structured our public meeting.

I don't think that was - so there's some issues. So if councilors could briefly directly themselves to how we might change either the weekend work, the introductory sessions, this wrap up session, or any aspect of our work program through the meeting that would be very helpful. I've got Wendy, Zahid, (Jen), thanks.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. So as I sent around an email just at the beginning of this meeting I'd like to suggest that we probably use our time as a Council more effectively for dialog and discussion and less for presentations.

I understand - so I'd suggested that we take reports and presentations as read, ask for as much as possible in writing, and start perhaps with a very brief overview but no more than a minute of introduction and really I would prefer a - you know, somebody gets up to the mic and says, any questions and immediately we could go into formulating the points of issue, agreement, disagreement, identifying the policy issues or - in matters of consensus from there.

I take (Wolf)'s point that we're also addressing others in the community who may not have the same background as we do but I think our first priority should be getting through Council business and for that we could do a lot of the work more effectively offline and use the face-to-face for discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Wendy. I would like to see if there are any responses to Wendy's point now before we move down the queue. So if - are there any direct responses to that?

Any support or not for that point because it's quite clear that we - you know, there may be two arguments. One is that we receive a decent and comprehensive update. The other is - or we could take this all as read and go straight into a more punchy dialog.

I've got (David), (Wolfgang) and (Wolf). And I'm conscious that there are others in the queues, Zahid and (Jen), but I'm looking for - just to try and capture the feeling around this point.

David Cake: So I take the point about the - you know, these are public things, we have an audience. But I'd be - and maybe a short presentation, sort of going over the issue, but we get - we don't get short.

We get very dense, very verbal, heavy presentations. I really feel most of the time if I had the same information put into a printed document I would absorb that, you know, much quicker, be able to refer back to it for questions. It would be far more useful. And the audience can do that too.

We can say to the audience, now if you were interested in this we have a document, download it. I think - you know, generally the audience for an ICANN meeting in any format has Internet access most of the time.

Jonathan Robinson: So you support Wendy?

David Cake: I'm very much in support of Wendy's motion. And just saying that I appreciate (Wolf)'s point and I'm sure - or (unintelligible) and I'm sure that we can come to a compromise that still understands that we have an audience but still makes much more efficient use of our time.

Jonathan Robinson: Zahid, (Wolf), and Mason on this topic.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you, I was going to support Wendy. So I also thought that maybe we should discuss how we - (Jonathan) handled motions but then I won't, if we can do that another time.

On the point of the GAC meeting, for instance, I thought that we - I mean we spent a good 30 minutes in presentations without discussion if I remember correctly, at least 20 minutes. And I think maybe one of the things we could structure also with the GAC is to have more time for discussions and actual dialogue rather than introductions. They know us, they understand many of the things, so we don't necessarily have to go into presentations. That would be my sort of duck-tails at Wendy's point.

I completely agree that the presentations need to be much more concise, a one pager saying, you know, the staff does an excellent job of providing executive summaries and conclusions in a document. Sort of - having two or three slides and then moving on to discussion maybe helpful.

This is not a criticism of how staff does presentations necessarily, it's just that...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: What about the brief for the presentation? This is an exact summary.

All right, on this topic I've got Wolfgang, Mason and Thomas and Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Nothing more to add to Wendy, (David) and Zahid. One Page is better than ten minute presentation.

Jonathan Robinson: We're getting support then. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Agreed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thomas, anything more to add?

Thomas Rickert: As much as I'm all in for efficiency and saving some of the Council time, we had some presentations where no questions were asked. So you know, do we ask working group chairs or folks, you know, like Patrick - we had presentations from Patrick if I remember correctly where no questions were asked.

Do we ask those people in the room and send them away immediately if nobody asks? I think we, you know, that might be a cultural or, you know, I find is somewhat difficult to engage with other groups within the ICANN ecosystem and then, you know, have people not report but just send them away because we don't have a discussion, if we plan to dive into the discussion immediately without a presentation.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Thomas. I think Joy has a feel for you.

Joy Liddicoat: Yes, thanks Thomas. We first thing, I mean other than according to, you know, (unintelligible) speak for the work that's going on, it's not necessarily problematic that we don't engage. I mean if we think the work is going well and that people should be likely to get on with that, I think just saying so is fine. You don't need to necessarily have questions, it's not a signal that something's wrong.

But having said that, you know, a practical solution might be to rather mischievously suggest that we allocate counselors to lead discussion on paper or (unintelligible) and then you will get discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Joy. So we have the idea would be that we'd have a - so far I've heard the practical suggestions are condensing presentations down to a single page and delegating to counselors to lead discussions. So we know at least one counselor has properly briefed them self from a subject which frankly, I really like the idea of. So I think those are two practical action items that Marika has all ready made a note of.

Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm actually leading more towards Wolf's point here because I think, you know, part of the point we gave and I think we tried to be really brief and to the point. But it's also (unintelligible) to provide some background to those in the audience or may be new to the Council or new to constituencies or stakeholder groups.

Because my concern would be if we indeed dive straight into the discussion, it would assume indeed that everyone has read the report which would be great if that indeed is the case - fantastic - I'm all for it. But I don't think it's necessarily a reality.

And we have some situations where reports come to the Council, and even though we have given updates on them, people go, "Why the hell is this in here? Why didn't we see this before?"

And I'm really worried that if we go straight to, "Okay, let's discuss and questions," that people may not pick up on some of the items that maybe aren't of concern to them, that they have an opportunity. If they see it in the presentation or, "Oh, I had no idea that this group was actually going to recommend this or that."

So I think, you know, if we operate under the assumption that everyone in the room has read everything and is completely abreast of what the issue is about, I think it can indeed do it - make it, you know, just a one side, "This is where we're at, let's open it up for questions." But I'm not really sure if that's the reality where we currently are and I don't think it either promotes new members to get engaged and interested in the topics.

Jonathan Robinson: Hearing a very valid point from Marika, I think we should respond to that. And we also have a structural problem which I'll highlight and that is the perceived or actual purpose of the weekends' sessions which is to some extent, it was I believe, designed to spend time in forming and educating and making sure that the Council was up to speed.

So let's just try and confine our self to that issue. Chuck, you seem to have got up to respond to that. I've got Wendy looking to respond to that point as well.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes. With regard to what Marika said and what others have been saying you can really have both.

What we don't need in the presentations is the background, all the steps the working group has taken, who is on the working group. I mean that's nice information but we can provide that. What we need is if there are recommendations, a brief list of the recommendations that would give people what they need to react if they haven't seen those recommendations.

So we can eliminate - I mean think about the presentations we watch. How many of them - and I'm not talking about something like the FSAC presentation; that's a little different story. How many times do we say, "Well here's the background, here's why we're doing this." I mean that's the kind of thing we can put in a document like (David) said and have available. We can

even have some printed - a few printed copies if somebody doesn't have online access.

Focus on the things where we really want the input. We'll limit those, don't give too much detail; enough so that they can see whether they have a concern or a question.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes and thanks for making that distinction Chuck between say the work of a working group and the presentation from another SO, AC coming to inform and educate the Council about their work. There is, I think, a quality distinction between those two.

Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: You know, just back to who is our audience over the weekend. Are we really expecting that members of the community are now arriving on Friday to be here with us through the weekend? And maybe they are, but in fact plenty are. But I really thought that our purpose on the weekend was to gather councilors for time to do things that we don't get in our two hour monthly meetings.

Jonathan Robinson: (Pete) and Wolf-Ulrich on this point.

Peter Rindforth: I like Chuck's suggestion that there could be a balance between the two approaches. So my suggestion for a one pager, for instance, wasn't that that's the only thing we have. You have a one-pager and then you have some slides, maybe two or three. And I'm thinking of four at the moment, possibly three.

One on background, the bad deals maybe, where did this come from so we don't have to address that in the audience. And outcome, here's what this has come out with without going into detail as Chuck said of how the thing we forward and how many days etcetera, meetings etcetera.

And then if necessarily, any potential issues that were discussed. And lastly, what does the Council need to do. Very quick, three or four slides, probably four, maybe maximum minutes. I mean sort of limit it as a tying the shoe as opposed to the number of slides I guess in a sense, and that maybe a balance.

Jonathan Robinson: So we're getting some direction here. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I fully agree to Chuck's proposal as well. And Chuck's coming back to the major of his weekend sessions.

So really I learned all the - this is my experience here in that environment. That is a GNSO session; it is a not open council session. So that means that a different approach, I think so.

And I have heard from somebody of the audience taking part several times that he was of the opinion that engagement of the board or in that environment in our discussions here is getting more and more, from his perception, more and more less. So we have to take care which means on the other hand that we should open up to more public discussions on issues as well.

So it is - I'm focused on that and I would like to state this point. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So Wolf, just to make it clear. We started off by saying we're getting too much information. We went over to having a single slide, we've expanded slightly up to the three or four slide position and that's where I'm seeing we're at, at the moment. Plus perhaps some print copies.

Are you in support of that? Yes, okay. So we're kind of settling on a position here which is an intention to make things briefer.

But my sense is that we do recognize that notwithstanding the fact that these were originally intended as GNSO Council work sessions and sort of briefing weekend workshop, it seems that more and more there is participation outside of the Council.

So Marika, Wendy and then I think we should try and wrap this up.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think maybe first I'll start off with a comment from a remote participant from (unintelligible). She said that, "Yes, can you members include constituency members," and they arrive for weekend work.

Then on my own comment. A couple of meetings back we had the practice and it was more - actually we did it before Council meetings and specifically for motions that were on the agenda where we did prepare a one or two page background briefing paper that briefly outlined like, you know, what is the issue about, what is the Council going to decide on, what is the background.

And maybe it's something to consider that we bring that back, at least for the working group, of dates to have that information, maybe in printed version or at least on the agenda available for indeed those that are newcomers. That before they come, they can read that and read up on why we're discussing this and what they can expect.

And then indeed focus the presentations really on, you know, where's the working group at, what are they going to recommend or what are the challenges they are encountering? You know, one of the Council may need to intervene. And maybe have as a background slide an annex slides or, you know, if the questions on the background and the process and those kinds of things.

So I think, indeed it's definitely a good suggestion to, as a compromise between the two, you know, focus on substance, have background

information available or at least leave enough time available to a real substantive discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I think we're coming to somewhere. Wendy, are you happy to - all right. So I think we've settled on something here just to capture it.

And so just to remind you of where we are on the agenda and where I left a couple of people out, we're talking about other reflections on the weekend - on the work and the taking of this meeting and how we might do it better or differently in Durbin.

And I left a lot of people out at that point. I had in that queue to deal with this main topic - then when we went down and dealt with detail - we had Zahid, (Jen) and Mason to come back onto any other mechanisms for improving the way in which we work during the course. So and I will have every sympathy if you now - if you thought about for whatever reason that point is now lost.

Zahid, do we skip over you at this point? (Jen), how are you doing?

(Jen): Yes, I just wanted to make the comment as we think about preparations for the next meeting that it was really concerning to me yesterday to see that the two motions brought were brought with clear intentions to withdraw them.

I'm not, you know, I'm new to the Council so perhaps I don't understand the policy or the procedure around your motion practice. But in any other corporate board or non-profit board that I have sat on, that is not professional motion practice.

So I'd just like to understand a little bit more about, you know, is that what typically happens and why and could that improved?

Joy Liddicoat: I'm sorry, I need to respond to that if I can.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem Joy. Just - I am concerned that this - that we need to make sure that we manage this topic. I think it's a valid question if that was the perception. But let's just make sure we deal with it effectively because I don't want us to go down a whole rat hole here.

I completely accept the question is valid, but let's just not get ourselves too wound up on this. Joy.

Joy Liddicoat: Well with all due respect, that's entirely not the case that the motions were presented with the intention to withdraw them. The motions were presented and seconded by, you know, across the Council and they generated consensus which was (unintelligible) from being withdrawn. They were not presented in any mischievous way to generate mischievous or abnormal (unintelligible).

I think that will be on the recording. And Jen, if you're concerned about that in the future, please just do come and talk about the motions with us.

Jonathan Robinson: My understanding is that the motions were brought in good faith ahead of the meeting. There was some prior discussion.

So let's go on to any other response to this point. Peter, were you - (unintelligible) come in? (Unintelligible) your hand Peter and then will go forward.

Peter Rindforth: I just wanted to add when it comes to our ccNSO, this is a wide suggest, but we had a lunch meeting and maybe next meeting we could arrange different tables and sit down and have some specific issues to discuss by each table and then make a presentation or summary.

Because I was a little bit disappointed that the meeting we had was - it was good general information from both sides. But when you meet with ccTLDs representatives during this meeting and you talk sort of privately with them, a

lot of issues came up that we have in common or have different aspects on that need to discuss.

And I think with that sort of single table meeting, we could do it more efficient.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, so we slightly lost our way on the queue here. I just want to make sure we're in shape.

As far as the ccNSO meeting with the ccNSO, it's clear it didn't work as effectively as it might. I'm going to ask Peter and John as our ccNSO liaison to pick up on this and perhaps do some work the ccNSO or to come back to the Council with a suggested improved format, and take it off the table for now.

Thomas, I just want to make sure we close off (Jen's) point on the motion because there is an issue of the purpose and nature of motions before the Council. So let's make sure we keep these in separate compartments.

So if we're responding to Jen's point which is in effect a sub-queue, I had Wolf-Ulrich first, I think I had Thomas and Zahid and (David).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Just - (Jen), you have a procedure or procedures and there's outlines on how we deal with this motion. So how it's motions and (unintelligible), so we are going to follow.

If you have a problem with that, then you can bring it up here and then it's going to assure to this SCI, they are sitting on this. We can deal with that as we did with the (unintelligible) motion and other matters about that.

The other thing is the second part of this story is how we handle, how we manage it. And there might be sometimes an interpretation or what else. But it should be very clear that we have this work, and then thinking about looking afterwards look better at problems and bring it up please.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Zahid next, Thomas, and then (David).

Zahid Jamil: So I'm going to be looking at the operating procedures in detail. But at least one point was made a little while earlier in response to Jen's comment that there was no intention of withdrawing the motion, it wasn't presented in a mischievous manner. And that basically, you know - so I just want to read up on the transcript.

                     (Jonathan), this is you. Jeff's saying, "Could you please explain what the motion's about?" "Jeff, let me help you. My understanding is that we'll go ahead. My understanding is that the motion will be withdrawn, but that the intention is to discuss the substance of it." That's how we started.

Joy Liddicoat: Sorry Zahid. It was withdrawn because there was consensus. I think you're being mischievous. That's what I think, I really do.

((Crosstalk))

Zahid Jamil: Let me clarify. I didn't...

Joy Liddicoat: Consensus hadn't resulted in - hadn't (unintelligible) or it wouldn't have been withdrawn.

Zahid Jamil: Let me clarify. First of all, I didn't say it was mischievous, I'm just saying - I'm responding to the comment that was made by (unintelligible).

                     Second, on this point, this was the beginning of the discussion so there was no consensus or lack of consensus and is how the agenda items started.

Jonathan Robinson: Zahid, let me make two points here. And I flag this with everyone.

Let's make sure we have a productive conversation here. Let's not go into something for the sake of minor detail discussion about the procedure.

You know, procedures as I said in my opening remarks yesterday, is an immensely valuable tool for us. And then on the specifics of that point, I said that my understanding was two things. I said, "Today, my understanding that motion that initially made at the point it was submitted in good faith.

There were a number of discussions prior to our actual council meeting as is appropriate in the run up to a meeting about how the motions may or may not be reformulated, may or may not remain on the table depending on the discussion. Perhaps I misspoke there and I should have - I miss chose my word and should have said, "Maybe withdrawn depending on the outcome."

So I accept the transcript as accurate, but nevertheless, perhaps I misspoke. I was, in a sense, attempting to head off, if you like, an unproductive discussion with my comment. But as it happened, we went in a rat hole in any event on that.

So I do want to give others the chance to speak. Thomas is being patient, (David) has been patient. But please remember what I said yesterday. Let's try not to get ourselves too entangled in the minutia of the procedure around this.

We in the end had a productive discussion, and that's where we should focus our efforts.

So I've got Thomas and (David).

Thomas Rickert: Thanks (Jonathan). I guess the observations that are made listening to what has been discussed yesterday is that we need to find ways to take these procedural aspects offline.

When you started the conversation about the timeliness of when these motions, you said, "I don't want to discuss this here. We're going to ask the SCI to help us with this." I guess that was a strong signal to the Council to focus on the subject matter.

And what we saw then, I guess, were three or four comments regarding points of order. So we as a Council very much have weakened and diluted the strong consensus that there was of the substance of the two motions.

So I guess that we should try to work on some sort of best practice to take the procedural point out of the public discussion because I think we're weakening our position and we're weakening the strength of the GNSO in general. Because what we have originally stated during the week in discussion whether it productive and were presented the views of the GNSO as such, and we should not work to the detriment of that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Thomas. (David)?

David Cake: Yes, I just want to first again stress that these motions were absolutely introduced in good faith with the intention that maybe people might consider voting for them and they might actually get through.

But I also want to - I mean Zahid, you seem to think that there was some kind of complicated, you know, a bit of underhand, you know - you seem to think that there was some intention to use the procedure in some way that was not intended. And I assure you that we are not masters of procedural manipulation. And in fact, if you had seen the NCSG sort of back channel, you would understand that we were in fact going, "No, no, we should do this or that."

The real intention here was perhaps when (Jonathan) said that this will be withdrawn. What he - I'm not in any blaming (Jonathan). Perhaps what might be better expressed as the likely outcome of this discussion will be that it will

be withdrawn on assuming that everyone who had been - the motion had been discussed with beforehand did what they said they were going to do. And the discussion went that it did, which as it happened it more or less did.

But until it actually gets to Council, our fellow counselors have the right to change their mind about the course of action that they take, and only once they have actually done it do we know where it will end up.

I assure you that there could have been circumstances where this was pushed through to a vote - or not.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you (David).

David Cake: He didn't know then until the discussion was...

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you (David). I think I'm going to cut the queue here as many of you have made the point in the meeting.

And now I think there was some, you know - I've qualified my statements that they perhaps could have been more equivocal. I think we've had the discussion. I think it doesn't - it lowers the tone for all of us to be obsessed with the minutia of procedural points.

We agreed that the weekend sessions do elevate our discussions. We succeeded in ultimately doing it. In fact, other than on this very specific topic, we've had a very productive conversation here.

And I just would encourage councilors to focus on that way of working together because it seems to put all of us in a better light as well as the council as a whole. So I think I'm going to call - put the discussion any further on this offline for the moment.

All right, I have a main queue now which we need to get back too. And in fact, Mason has been immeasurably patient in waiting to get in line on that main queue which is really, any reflections on this - on how we've worked during the course of this meeting and how we might improve any ways of working in the future meeting in Durbin.

Mason Cole: Thank you (Jonathan). So I do want to move back to the idea of reviewing our week and then looking at Durbin and figuring out how we can improve.

We now have - as a Council, we now have four major sessions. We have two days a week in work, we have the main public council meeting, and we have the wrap up session.

When I started doing ICANN work, there was one session and was the main public meeting and that was all. The weekend sessions became necessary to help us organize ourselves for the public meeting. My point of view is those sessions should be used to prepare for and conduct Council business.

The community, I think, can be relied on to exercise its duty to learn about issues that are important to the community, and then come prepared to deal with Council business if the Council is the forum to conduct that business.

So I intend not to worry too much about whether or not community members are missing out on information that is unavailable to them in other forums. Excuse me.

So with regard to how we organize our week, let me share something that was useful when I was privileged to chair the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Before meeting, I would get to together with the ExCom and we would plan - we wouldn't plan the schedule itself until we understood what outcomes we wanted for that week. So I might suggest the Council consider a similar method.

If we know there are motions to be agreed to, there are issues to discuss or what have you, we organize ourselves around the outcomes. I think it can be easy to fall into the idea that we need time with the Board, we need time with ccNSO, we need time with the GAC, we need time with so and so. In reality, we may not need any time.

We may be more wise to prioritize our time toward getting work done as a Council rather than feeling like we're owed time with other organizations because damn it, everybody else gets their time and we want ours too.

Now I'm not being flippant about this. I'm just saying the time that at ICANN meeting is so compressed and so busy that I think we need to be very, very smart especially in Durban and Buenos Aires when things are only going to get more busy during an ICANN week and the pressure's on the GNSO are going to be even more pronounced that we go about working in a very smart way.

And I might suggest that I don't necessarily have a way forward to do this but maybe there's (Jonathan) and Wolf and I can do when we plan for Durban and present it to the Council as an idea. But I would be willing to put some thought into that ahead of time so that we come up with outcomes for Durban and then work our way backward into planning for the week.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mason. That's a very positive suggestion. The only challenge there is of course the issue in and around concurrent scheduling. But we can work with that. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. I agree with almost everything you said there Mason. And maybe I misunderstood part of it. But I think it would be a (death) dangerous precedent if the weekend session as well as really all of the GNSO activities doing the work became Council centric and not GNSO centric.

The Council is the policy management body. The GNSO has a whole develops policy. So I just caution you be careful about that. And you probably didn't mean the way - mean it the way I took and I accept that. But be very careful there.

It's the whole GNSO that develops the policy so it's very important in the weekend sessions and I think Wolf-Ulrich tried to hit on this a little bit too that we do involve the community and we get good involvement. We have for a long time. And that's really critical that we continue to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. If I could just offer perhaps a spin on Chuck was saying and to agree with Mason. That I think it's also the responsibility of the Councilors to manage input from the community.

And but we need to do that by managing, you know, ourselves, not - and I'm not saying we should be acting as filters or funnels but that we do - we need the time to manage our own business and should be taking that time that we need, not seeing everything as totally whoever's in the room is an equal part of - I'm sorry. I'm - I'll stop.

Jonathan Robinson: That's Wendy. It happens to us all. It's a little late in the week. All right. I'm going to close that off now. We've dealt with some constructive input as to how we can improve things going forward and I think you've left Wolf-Ulrich and (Liza Vasu) are going to work.

I should say there is not the exclusive preserve of the Vice-Chair and anyone is welcome to step up to the plate with any element of organizing the activities during the Durban meeting.

I mean, you know, for example, trivial point but nevertheless important, Ching was very good as our effective local host in sorting out our dinner on

Saturday night. But there are many other elements of the logistics and the - and there are limits of organizing the meeting that make for a quality meeting.

Moving on then to another meaty topic that I hope we will not get too distracted by is the policy and implementation issue. Now as far as I can tell, the primary outcome from that that seems to have been suggested but may not be taken up by all and I'd like your thoughts on this is that we send a letter from the GNSO Council out to either SOs and ACs seeking interest in either the - and saying that we intend to take action and move the policy and implementation discussion forward.

And we would seek to do that in conjunction with other SO and ACs. But should they not be responsible or interested taking that forward we do intend to pick up the challenge in any event ourselves. So can I have comments on either the sort of substance or tone of that point? Because I think that from my understanding is the primary action that's come out of the policy implementation discussion as far as we are concerned. Yes (Steve).

(Steve):   (Jonathan), I would just add a qualifier to the end of the sentence. You said that we would invite them to join at the outset but that if they didn't that we would move forward. But I think you have to add to that that once we move forward the participation of any of those cross community AC/SOs is welcome at any time in the process. That's all I would ask.

Jonathan Robinson:Thanks (Steve). That's helpful and of course that is the case. It's not to say that you put up or shut up or, you know, forever lose your opportunity but nevertheless we would invite input from the outset and of course anyone's welcome to come along for the ride at any point. John.

John Berard: Just from a tactical point of view, don't you already have an SO/AC (rump) group that needs (chat and stocks)? I mean - yeah. I mean couldn't we just - couldn't we just find out more directly, more quickly from that group?

Jonathan Robinson: But that point Chuck - I'm sorry. John, the SO and AC just came across my vision as you coming to sit down. The - yeah. We do - the only - the (rump) group as you - is the SO and AC leadership meeting with the senior staff that took place on the (lofty) side of the bay now on the Friday before of this meeting - the initial Friday of this meeting, almost a week ago now.

And so I can easily reach out via that channel and see what the expressions of interest are. Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe there's also a dedicated mailing list, which may as well be a quicker informal channel than formal letters.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Well that seems to deal with that item then.

John Berard: Can we give ourselves a deadline and suggest that the charter be for voting either in May or June before we even get to Durban?

Jonathan Robinson: Very good point John. Actually I think that Marika if we could take that as an action item to set up a schedule of activity ahead of Durban because I think we committed that our work end session - I'm losing it now. That our working sessions on the weekend - work end sessions - to make some significant - as significant progress as possible by Durban.

So, you know, that's fine. So another way of looking at it as soon as (Jonathan) gets back from his holiday next week.

Right. So we've got - we touched on the GNSO. I think we're - I think we've - we touched on the GNSO review points more broadly earlier on. So I'm going to skip over that to the motions due eight business days before meeting. Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's not on the motions but maybe on the GNSO review. Just one suggestion maybe there because I think there are different ideas and different parallels, tracks and publications going on.

An idea may be to form a little committee or a little group that serves as well as a contact point for all these different conversations and look into, you know, some of the ideas that have been suggested like the self-review or previous work that has been done on that. Maybe that's a way of trying to coordinate that and serve as well as a sounding board for, you know, whatever the speaker's doing or when (Brian) has a question.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. Let me help there because there are actually four sub bullet points under there. Let's consider our own self-review. Look at the previous self-review work, understand any link or overlap with ATRT, coordinate with (Ray). And in fact there's a fifth point and it sort of links to the point Joy raised earlier.

And it's really what I've been thinking about here and I haven't properly and fully formulated yet. But one is Joy's point about looking 3 to 12 months ahead of what might be on the work of the Council. And in many ways I'd like to even link that further into the broader work that ICANN's going to be coming up to be doing on the strategic thinking.

And it's really the role of the GNSO and the GNSO Council within that broader strategy. So my thinking here - it is very early. So, you know, I'll be open to further discussion either through this group that Marika suggested or via any other channel is I think we don't want ICANN and the - Zahid, if I could ask you to take this offline a minute just so we keep the conversation focused on the topic (unintelligible).

My thinking is here is that if we can take - if we can think about making sure that the GNSO and the GNSO Council is part of any strategic work that ICANN does rather than outside of that. And we make sure - and so to the

extent that there's any review, self-review or future development work that that's linked into any strategic thinking or strategic planning that goes on. So that's really in a sense of fifth sort of bullet that should fit under there.

Okay. So Marika suggested we form a small group. I think that makes a lot of sense. Joy.

Joy Liddicoat: Yes. Just one thing might be not recalling (unintelligible) deprived but I seem to recall you need to - might be some (unintelligible) of an extra day around the meeting in November. And I just wonder whether we couldn't pick - schedule a, you know, a session on the particular topic.

Jonathan Robinson: Excellent point. Thanks for reminding of it. Let me just remind the Councilors and anyone in the room of what exactly that is. That is a proposal for a day on the Friday of the third meeting in the year, which is in this case the Buenos Aires meeting.

And the objective of that day is to recognize that Councilors join the Council on the Thursday of that meeting session. And then we go off into a form of black hole. Of course we have interim meetings but we have no face-to-face time and no opportunity to bring those Councilors up to speed to start to work with them.

So in effect to use that as a formal - both induction and forward planning, integration. So the form and format of that day has yet to be crystallized. At the moment it's the subject of a budget application. But yes, good point. And it does link to the extent that we put any of that strategic work into that day. So thank you. Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Going back to the review. You know, this is a new question. I don't think it's very different from that what we did some years ago under Chuck's leadership, you know, this so-called improvement process with the GNSO.

So right now forming a group would be welcome. We have to discuss it within our dedicated stakeholder groups. And but, you know, the initiative should be come here - should come from - through the Council.

So there may be different let me say different stages of - or different achievements in the different stakeholder groups at the time being, you know, because different timings of how to discuss it but it should be initiated so that we have - and I might have (unintelligible).

You need also a kind of thinking about the schedule ahead, you know. But just starting and throwing it into the discussion but having something because the stakeholder groups consider to have their own priorities so to deal with those matters.

But it should come from the Council initiative and it should be asked to the stakeholder groups or to contribute, to send members from them to that group coordinating that and then we could go forward.

Jonathan Robinson: That point and that's exactly one of the other reasons why I would make sure it's coordinated with the work that (Ray)'s doing in his capacity on the call.

Okay. I don't believe there's a lot to be said under this issue of eight motions to you eight business days before the meeting. I mean to me there's really two questions. We've been operating eight days before the meeting and the question is does that then turn into eight business day as we've said doesn't have a global meaning.

So the question is eight calendar days or ten calendar days and there's a minor series of questions. I suppose for me the question is is this something we could deal with ourselves. It seems sufficiently small. And so what the question I would like to ask is do we need to refer to the SCI or can we just simply tidy this up as part of our operating procedures.

So I'd like a comment specifically to that question if this - if there's a firmly held view or understanding that this does need to be referred to the SCI or whether it's something we can quickly and simply tidy up with a - some more careful wording on our operating procedures?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No specific views on whether this should go to the SCI or not but I do believe there is a requirement that any change to the operating procedures need to be posted for a minimum of 21 days for comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Fair enough. And so that's fine. I mean we could propose those changes, get the comments on them and get them sorted out without spinning our wheels in the SCI, you know, just putting unnecessary work across the SCI. But I'm conscious that, you know, of any comment that there may be about due process. So Wolf-Ulrich, Wendy.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I understand that there should come out a proposal how to formulate that, you know. There is something in the role (unintelligible) although there are certainly taking some just on their (unintelligible). But the question here was specifically around the timing, you know. Is it (unintelligible) 23.59 (unintelligible). You know. Or we should be taking the consideration. I did hear it will come to discussions in the future.

Jonathan Robinson: The tight wording could deal with both of those issues relatively easily. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: I would propose that it's something we could deal with at Council and I would be happy to put forward a proposal.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. I'd like to hear that Wendy and so let's take that offline. Let's hear your proposal. Are there any concerns or serious objections? The essence of it is that we will propose a tighter form of wording that deals with the two issues that arose here. One is eight business days versus eight calendar

days. And you might argue that the intent of eight business days was to go for ten calendar days. So to me that's the only question, is it eight or ten?

And second of all is it then the time zone of the meeting or is it UTC or what is the actual time zone? So those need to be the two relatively simple technical points that need to be dealt with. Is everyone - can I close this item off or does anyone want to make a comment? I mean we're expecting - Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I just have a question to Marika. When you say 21 day comment, is that a formal ICANN public comment or 21 days for GNSO participants to comment?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I would need to double check but I think it's a requirement like for - as well for the Board oversight. So that there is a - I think it is public comments but I'll double check what the proximity is on that if any.

Jonathan Robinson: So Wendy to propose revised wording. Marika to confirm the process. And we move it on from there. Great. John Berard.

John Berard: The fact that we now have an issue report template, do you think that we will now begin to see an uptick in the number of - in that activity at the Council? Do you see our workload increasing because we have now made it easier to participate?

Jonathan Robinson: John, that's - I mean you're moving us along the agenda effectively. But let's go on to that template for an issue report. Marika to respond.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I think it's actually the opposite because what we tried to do with the template is - I mean the template was already in the PDP manual. And the idea behind it is to re-encourage those that want to submit a request for an issue report to provide as much information upfront as possible.

To really detail the information and day that it's available on the issue. To detail what kind of conversations or discussions have already taken place on the topic. So it's really try to encourage that more instead of people just throwing out issues and then, you know, having staff trying to figure out what is available.

So it's really trying to actually focus the work of the Council more and really make sure that those are issues that are brought to the Council have, you know, sufficient support and data within the request itself for the Council then to effectively consider.

But again, the template is there as a mechanism. It's not a requirement. But we do hope that it's maybe seen as a useful tool in how to dig out what kind of information is typically needed or expected to be received as part of an issue report request.

Jonathan Robinson: Issue report. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think Marika implicitly just answered my question saying it's an option, not a requirement. My question was going to be - the wording in the documents I've seen talked about Councilors submitting things. That implies that it's for issues reports - issue reports for questions by the GNSO Council and not by ACs and the Board. But I guess it doesn't really matter. It's option. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I mean the source of the concern was the potential - the low threshold for an issue report and the pre-qualification. You know all about that. All right. So going, going, gone.

I don't know where else we can - we've got review of motions for the next session. We've got the information channels for review of RAA. Privacy Proxy Drafting Team - I'm not sure that I - Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I think that item may need a little bit more time because I think we do need to await the final version of the RAA and the closing report to identify which issues are still open so we can continue with the PDP. But the idea is once we have that, as you may recall we did initiate or we had an issue report on the RAA some (unintelligible) with the RAA negotiations.

The idea being that any issues that were on the list of items that were in the list that was developed by the working group that were not being - that were not addressed as part of the RAA negotiations that they would then be - go into the PDP.

I think the one obvious one that we've seen now is on privacy proxy accreditation. So I think that's one where, you know, as soon as we have a clear indication that we can move forward that, the idea is then to go straight into a drafting team or a charter and move that forward. But there may be other items there that can come up I guess.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for reminding me. So the way I currently - my current understanding of how this is going to work out is that there is an RAA posted for public comment. That RAA is likely to be updated and ultimately finalized at which point we will see probably two things happening.

I expect that will become clear then what has been fully incorporated within that RAA contractually and what remains for work within the PDP process and I expect Wendy to flag that issue for us at the Council if there's anything (specific) since she's keeping a vigilant eye on what needs to be discussed at Council level of that.

Right. Marika.

Marika Konings: On the other items on the list - this is Marika. If I can just mention maybe that the CWG because that's one of the items that's on our project list already for a really long time and nothing active is being done. Something we've

suggested actually I think just to the Chair so the only thing that has gone to the Council is because I think the last status of that is that that a Council develop these principles.

I think they were sent to the different SOs/ACs for their feedback. I do believe there was some misunderstanding or some felt that the GNSO was trying to dictate what the principles of CWG should be. So I think the idea was that this is what we think it should be. Tell us what you think and we can maybe come somewhat halfway - meet somewhat halfway.

Suggestions were made at - a couple meetings ago I think in the meeting with the ccNSO that maybe we should consider a cross community working group on cross community working groups. We did send out a request from for volunteers I think a couple of times but actually didn't get any traction whatsoever.

And so our suggestion at this stage is to actually - I think the only one - the only group that specifically said that they had any comments or suggestions was the ccNSO to maybe just go back to them and say tell us what you think or what suggestions you have, see what they come up with, take those back.

Based on that if there's agreement to incorporate those or change those, put them in there, send it out for another round to the different groups and say well, let's do it this way. We don't need to form a working group at this - tell us what you think and as a kind of discussion negotiation. But as a way of either, you know, moving it forward or just closing it. That's the other option.

Jonathan Robinson: Fine. That seems like a practical way forward. So we'll communicate with the ccNSO and ultimately having taken any input or feedback from them. Send it around for another round. And then either accept that as currently our recommended practice and it's as best was we can do. Any other comments or input on that? John.

John Berard: (Jonathan), I'm mindful of the time. And in keep - one of the - there are a number of things we talked about this morning about points we've made, thrown over the wall and we haven't heard anything back. They're going to be talking at the public forum about one of those things.

The other recall is the consumer metrics work that we did. The fact is that we're looking at the introduction of new gTLDs. In the short term the requirements there are to start collecting data. The question is what data? So we haven't really heard back from the Board with regard to the advice.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So let's - we're going to have to wrap things up now as you say given the time of where things are. My understanding is we have a - essentially we've either comment in the affirmative or not comment on that draft of the statement I intend to make in public at the public forum today.

So - and that is the essential basis of - on which I will also write to the Board and CEO. So that I think we have dealt with but let me just pause for a moment and see if there's anything other than the comment that has been made online with that.

And second John, I'm hearing you say that you would like to hear what regarding the consumer - what action would you seek to achieve? A reminder to the Board there to where this goes next or what action would you like to see on the consumer metrics?

John Berard: Merely that the, you know, we've thrown - we've made these - we've given them this advice, we're looking at the dawn of this new program that will have to - and data will have to be collected against whatever metrics the, you know, the Board has selected out of the group that we have given them. So which ones are they going to focus on so, you know, we can be confident that the data will be collected and the report at the end of the year will be accurate?

Jonathan Robinson: Are you asking that we write to the Board to remind them and don't ask - or take that up as a written response to the Board or what are...

John Berard: I think that doing it in writing is the best way to go.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So let's take that - let's take that as an action. And I'm sure you'll help me draft something to write and we'll circulate that to the Council.

All right everyone. We're going to call it a day there. I think we've done a pretty good job of nailing that list. There's a couple of things that we haven't dealt with and we will pick them up. I mean they're here for you all to see.

Thank you very much for coming to this session. I know it's at the tail end of the meeting. I think it's been a productive session. We've spent - a couple of times we've thanked Glen for all her hard work. But I think we owe a duty of gratitude to - I was going to say to all of the ICANN policy staff who support us so admirably between and during these meetings.

And my personal thanks in particular to Marika who does a fantastic job and I'm very appreciative of here support personally but I'm sure the Council as a whole. So thank you to the ICANN policy staff and in particular Marika. See you all online or in Durban.

END